

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
)
v.) No. 5:08-CV-176-BO
)
)
TOWN OF CARY, NC, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)
— — — — —
WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
)
v.) No. 5:11-CV-31-BO
)
)
SCOTT L. WILKINSON,)
)
 Defendant.)
— — — — —
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
)
v.) No. 5:14-CV-46-BO
)
)
WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.)
)
 Defendant.)
— — — — —
WAKE COUNTY NC HUMAN)
SERVICES,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
)
v.) No. 5:14-CV-47-BO
)
)
WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
 Defendant.)
— — — — —

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on motions by William Scott Davis Jr., *pro se*, filed pursuant to Rule 60 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Davis seeks to set aside and vacate all orders and judgments entered in the above-captioned cases. Davis contends that (1) the respondents fraudulently concealed a conspiracy of the Wake County District Attorney's Office, (2) that a state criminal proceeding against Davis involved illegal searches and seizures, (3) that there was a conspiracy to illegally manufacture and fraudulently fabricate criminal domestic violence malicious prosecution evidence, (4) that the respondent fraudulently concealed malicious use and abuse of process, (5) that respondents fraudulently concealed that state attorneys conspired to illegally manufacture and fraudulently fabricate evidence, and (6) that the UNC School of Medicine Department of Psychiatry via sham, ruse, and farce illegally conducted an unauthorized forensic evaluation.

These cases have each been dismissed, judgment has been entered, appeals have been taken, and mandates have issued. Davis' current motion, which is at best difficult to decipher, does not appear to provide the Court with any basis upon which to reopen these matters or provide Davis with any relief from judgment. Moreover, a pre-filing injunction has been entered against Davis. See *Davis v. Mitchell*, 5:12-CV-493-F (E.D.N.C. March 3, 2014). Insofar as Davis

is attempting to use the instant motion in these closed cases as a method by which to avoid the pre-filing injunction,¹ the Court will not sanction such action.

Accordingly, the Rule 60 motion to set aside and vacate all orders and judgments is DENIED in each of the above-captioned cases.

SO ORDERED, this 21 day of October, 2020.


TERRENCE W. BOYLE
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ A pre-filing injunction has also been issued against Mr. Davis in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, *Davis v. Town of Cary North Carolina*, No. 16-1377, 2017 WL 1403166 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2017), and the Eastern District of Virginia, *Davis v. Jawaorski*, No. 4:13-CV-63 (E.D. Va. Nov. 14, 2013).